



## ***Indiana Professional Standards Board***

---

*Joseph E. Kernan, Governor*  
*Marie Theobald, Ed.D. Executive Director*

101 W. Ohio Street-Suite 300  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1953  
Telephone: (317) 232-9010  
Toll free: (866) 542-3672  
Fax: (317) 232-9023  
[www.in.gov/psb](http://www.in.gov/psb)

# **School Social Work Advisory Group Edit Team**

## **Action Report: Standards Revisions Resulting From Public Comment**

**August 15, 2003**

## Introduction

In May 2003, universities, stakeholders, and individuals across the state of Indiana received an electronic copy of the newly developed School Social Work standards, a survey and a memorandum requesting feedback and responses to the survey. Additionally, the School Social Work Advisory committee mailed out 350 hard copies of the draft standards to school social workers listed on the Indiana Department of Education mailing list. This mailing included a cover letter from the committee emphasizing the importance of receiving feedback from practitioners in the field. In June 2003 sixty responses were received from 55 school social workers, 3 district administrators, 1 university faculty member and 1 MSW student.

The edit team consisted of four members of the advisory committee including the chair. The edit team met on August 15, 2003 to discuss the responses to the survey. The following chart summarizes survey results:

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u> (5)	<u>Agree</u> (4)	<u>Undecided</u> (3)	<u>Disagree</u> (2)	<u>Strongly Disagree</u> (1)	<u>Total Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
#1	The standards are written in a clear, understandable manner.								
	25	30	2	2	1	60	4.2667	.67345	.82064
#2	The standards are sensitive to ethnic & cultural diversity.								
	20	30	9	1	0	60	4.1500	.53644	.73242
#3	The standards are gender neutral.								
	32	26	1	1	0	60	4.4833	.38955	.62414
#4	The standards reflect the current knowledge base (i.e., "best practices") available to educators.								
	23	27	7	1	0	58	4.2586	.54598	.73890
#5	There are important related ideas that are NOT covered by these standards.								
	3	12	11	27	5	58	2.6724	1.13642	1.06603
#6	Some of the standards are redundant.								
	3	20	12	23	2	60	2.9833	1.06751	1.03321
#7	The issues addressed in the standards cover the critical concerns of my constituents.								
	14	39	3	1	0	57	4.1579	.34962	.59129
#8	The performance statements correlate clearly with the knowledge and disposition statements.								
	15	41	4	0	0	60	4.1833	.28785	.53652
#9	The performances that are described are assessable.								
	8	41	8	2	1	60	3.8833	.54548	.73857
#10	The standards are realistic.								
	14	36	7	3	0	60	4.0167	.55904	.74769

The edit committee discussed question #5 and #6 listed above. Although there was some indication that related ideas were not covered in the draft standards, there was no indication in feedback from survey respondents that related ideas were not addressed. The committee

determined that question 5 may have been somewhat confusing, reviewed the standards for any items that may have been left out, and determined that no important related ideas were left out.

In terms of item #6, the edit committee concluded that any existing redundancy is necessary to create meaningful linkages among the standards and therefore not cause for any revision.

## **Summary of Revisions**

Based on the feedback reviewed, consensus of the draft standards document, the edit team made minimal revisions.

Page 3, #3 under Knowledge: It was suggested that the term “at-risk children” be changed to “children at-risk.” The committee agreed with this suggestion and the change was made.

Page 3, #4, under Performances: One respondent noted that numbers 1-3 in this section began with a verb. Therefore, number 4 was revised to begin with the word “Work” rather than “works.”

Page 5, under Dispositions and Page 8 under Dispositions: It was noted that it is grammatically correct that a (1) must follow with a (2) in a list rather than just listing a (1). Therefore both of these dispositions were revised to read in a sentence format rather than a list format.

Page 9, #2 under Performances: One respondent suggested that the word “available” be inserted between “use” and “professional” to reflect the fact that school social workers must get supervision from all possible resources. In some cases this supervision is not available within that school corporation and may have to come from outside the district.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the 60 survey responses reviewed, the edit committee concluded that there was strong approval of the school social work standards as written. The standards have undergone minimal revision and remain aligned with both the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards and the IPSB School Services standards.